



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/779,715

02/18/2004

Sheng Hsin Liao

MR1957-852

1729

4586

7590

06/07/2006

ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE
3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101
ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043

EXAMINER

JULES, FRANTZ F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,715

Applicant(s)

LIAO, SHENG HSIN

Examiner

Frantz F. Jules

Art Unit

3617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(2) as being anticipated by Thorland et al (US 2005/0170,686 A1).

Thorland et al discloses a computer peripheral with a cable reeling device comprising a detachable reeling device (20) adapted to be electrically coupled to a computer (10a) and selectively coupled to anyone of a plurality of peripheral devices such as a printer (30) a disclosed on page 2 section [0015], lines 5-10, having a housing and a communication cable, said communication cable including a first end and a second end respectively connecting with a first connector and a second USB connector (24, 25) and being extensibly wound in the housing with at least one extractable end; and an input device detachably coupled with a front portion of the reeling device since all PDA has an input device, and electrically coupled to the reeling device, said reeling device being independently operable with regard to said input device, wherein said reeling device electrically couples anyone of said plurality of peripheral devices to said computer, see page 2, section [0015], lines 5-10, section [0022].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorland et al (US 2005/0170686 A1) in view of Liao (US 6,337,444 B1).

Thorland et al teach all the limitations of claims 3-4 Yong teaches all the limitations of claims 3-5 except for a computer peripheral comprising a third connector plugged into a second connector. The general concept of providing an extension connector to the end of a cable falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious duplication of parts which carry no patentable weight as illustrated by Liao which discloses the teaching of a third connector (21) plugged into a second connector (11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yong to include the use of a plurality of connectors to the end of a cable in his advantageous computer peripheral cable in order to provide for attachment with a different size or type input device or ports.

5. Claims 7-9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorland et al (US 2005/0170686 A1) in view of Sugita (US 2003/0184,521 A).

Claims 7-9, 11

Thorland et al teach all the limitations of claims 7-9 and 11 except for a computer peripheral with cable reeling device used in a mouse application as input device. The

Art Unit: 3617

general concept of using a cable reeling device in a mouse application as input is well known in the art as illustrated by Sugita which discloses the teaching of a computer peripheral with cable reeling device (21) used in a mouse application as input device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Thorland et al to include the use of a cable reeling device used in a mouse application as input device in his advantageous computer peripheral system as taught by Sugita in order to prevent tangle of cables in the system thereby improving safety for the user.

Claims 10, 12

Thorland et al teach all the limitations of claims 10 and 12 except for a plurality of posts engaging corresponding holes in the housing. The general concept of providing a plurality of posts engaging holes in the housing of a mouse is well known in the art as illustrated by Sugita which a plurality of posts engaging holes in the housing of a mouse, see fig. 14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Thorland et al to include the use of a plurality of posts engaging holes in the housing of a mouse as taught by Sugita in order to facilitate maintenance of the mouse.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 04/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Applicant's argument regarding that a mouse alone cannot anticipate the claims has been found valid and prompts the new ground of rejection. Applicant claim is merely

Art Unit: 3617

drawn to a PDA ~~having a cable reeling device therein~~. It is factual that a PDA is capable of use with multiple devices for instance a computer, a printer, a fax machine, a hand held computer.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Laity et al, Wei, Hanna et al, Burke are cited to show a related computer peripheral with capability of use with multiple devices.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (571) 272-6681. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (571) 272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3617


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Frantz F. Jules
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3617

FFJ

June 1, 2006

FRANTZ F. JULES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frantz F. Jules', with a stylized flourish at the end.